

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

28 February 1969


SUBJECT: Detachment "G" Manpower Survey, December 1968

TO: Commander

1. I have reviewed the Manpower Survey Report which was conducted during December 1968.
2. I have given a lot of thought to the recommendations which reflect upon the staff of the Director of Support. I generally concur in these recommendations with the exception of the position occupied by [redacted] You have generously agreed that [redacted] will continue to be assigned to the Installations Office during the remainder of his tour, but that his replacement will revert to Support Aircraft Maintenance. I agree in this recommendation. 25X1A 25X1A
3. In Paragraph 4 of the report on the functions of the Director of Support, I do not agree with the Manpower Committee that the construction program here at North Base should be completed by the end of FY 1969 and that there should be no further requirements for [redacted] position. 25X1A  
With the various construction projects which are in the planning stages such as renovation of Hangar 1, resurfacing and widening of the runway, the new LOX facility; all of these programs will take us well into FY 1970. Of equal importance is one fact the Manpower Committee seems to have overlooked. The supervising and handling of construction projects here at North Base are just a portion of [redacted]'s duties. He is responsible for all maintenance problems for this unit. He must coordinate with EAFB Supply concerning the requisition of special parts, etc. In addition, there is constantly a requirement for liaison with personnel of the EAFB Civil Engineering Department. Therefore, [redacted] and [redacted] will not be surplus to my Directorate notwithstanding the recommendations of this survey. If the position presently occupied by [redacted] is deleted in the beginning of FY 1970, immediate steps will be taken to engage an employee on a contractual basis. Notwithstanding the success of my recruiting efforts, I will do the best that I can and supervise the Installations Branch. 25X1A 25X1A 25X1A
4. I am not a believer in a "fat" table of organization, but I believe that with the present workload that the

Support Director is now engaged in and with the construction program which presently has been approved, consideration should be given to the retention of these positions and assignment to this Directorate well into FY 1970.

25X1A



Director of Support

MATERIEL

REF PAGE 5, PAR F.

First sentence no longer true. Should hold slot until runway, hangar, and whatever else comes up is complete.

REF PAGE 5, PAR G.

I view first sentence with great skepticism. We've been saying this for months but requirements curve spirals upward. Don't 25X1A know about Ops, but for example there are several new  up that will require extensive flight test.

REF PAGE 6, PAR I.

Some question about content of first sentence. Still not settled but apparently the "C" will still be active. How many drivers will be dual-qualified, etc?

REF PAGE 7, PAR K.

In view of all above, I question summary.

REF PAGE 8 AND 9

I just don't think it's time to commit ourselves yet.

REF PAGE 31, PAR A - QC&E

Ref  request for full-time inspector for Support

Maintenance and C/G Maintenance.

REF PAGE 35, PAR E

ONE T-35 technician is inadequate to support detachment training, testing and deployment requirements. We can get by with two provided a third is available in plant to replace sick, lame, and lazy when a deployment is in progress.

REF PAGE 37, PAR C

Wrong! A machinist runs the machine shop. The "Utility"

Maintenance Tech is

REF PAGE 41, [REDACTED]

PAR B.1 - DO NOT CONCUR.

1. This will add a government slot, contrary to current policy.

2. Equivalent pay would present a problem.

3. Would be subject to reassignment at the end of a tour.

This should be a permanent position to insure continuity.

4. <sup>WHY</sup> [REDACTED] is a change necessary???

NOTE: Functions indicated on Page 43 are no longer appropriate.

PAR B.3 - Probably better to be transferred to a non-involved vendor's contract to preclude accusations of partiality, etc.

REF PAGE 42, PAR 5

RE  request for full-time inspectors for Support

Maintenance and C/G Maintenance.


REF PAGE 42, PAR 6

Concur, if the recommendation means that we retain seven  
Ilycons, 5 in the shop and 2 in processing.

REF PAGE 42, PAR 7

25X1A

Do not concur. Same as Ref Page 35. Do not concur.



OPERATIONS

Page 9, Para G:

Do not agree that ops officers fulfill flying requirements normally done by pilots. The purpose of reducing the ~~amount~~<sup>number</sup> of drivers to six was economy and lack of flying time available. Now we say check out two ops officers so they can do some of the test flying. It costs \$32,000 just for the two suits plus expense of suit fittings etc. Plus if they are going to do test flying we should get them at least 10 hrs per month for each man. It would be cheaper to hire an additional driver.

Page 14, Para C:

Only one ops officer goes on a deployment to assist the commander. There are times when an ops officer is the detachment commander, then he would have an ops officer to assist him. Do not agree that the LSO cannot fulfill the ops officer requirement on a carrier operation.

Page 18, Command Post, Para B:

There is only one NCO assigned to the command post. One is a clerk typist and the other a Form 5 Clerk.

*10 Mar 69.*


LIFE SUPPORT

There is no mention of the addition of a clerk typist slot for life support.

We were of the opinion that this team was going to favorably mention the addition of such a slot.

Would like to formally request such a position as soon as possible.

25X1A



Director, Life Support